FROM: The Secretariat

Inclusion of the International Food Policy Research Institute in the CGIAR System

At its meeting in November 1978 the CGIAR considered the request by the International Development Research Centre and the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations that IFPRI be included in the CGIAR System. The Group asked TAC to consider this request and make its recommendations to the Group.

Attached for the information of CG Members and other participants in the CGIAR Meeting on May 3-4, 1979 is the TAC paper No. AGD/TAC:IAR/79/13 entitled "TAC Conclusions and Recommendations on the Inclusion of the International Food Policy Research Institute in the CGIAR System." Also attached is the "Report of TAC Mission to IFPRI" (AGD/TAC:IAR/79/5).

These reports will be considered under agenda item 4 of the CGIAR Meeting.
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Mr Warren Baum, Chairman  
Consultative Group on International  
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1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20433

Dear Mr Baum:

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, at its meeting held in Washington in November 1978 requested the TAC to consider the request of the International Food Policy Research Institute for being brought within the group of institutions supported by the CGIAR and to report its findings and recommendations to the CGIAR at an early date. The TAC reviewed this request and organized a panel under the chairmanship of Prof. C.C. Thomsen of the Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University of Copenhagen, a member of the TAC to study the question in depth. Other members of the panel were Dr C. Hanumantha Rao, Director, Institute of Economic Growth, New Delhi; Dr Randolph Barker, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY; Dr Eduardo Venezian, Universidad Catolica de Chile; and Mr P.J. Mahler, Executive Secretary of TAC. Terms of reference for the panel were circulated to the CGIAR for comment and suggestions as to the questions to be addressed by the panel.

The panel met with IFPRI in Washington, 9-12 January 1979, and received full cooperation and assistance from the Institute. The panel's report was considered by the TAC at its 21st Meeting held 13-20 February 1979. The TAC generally endorsed the panel's findings and made an affirmative recommendation for the inclusion of IFPRI within the CGIAR, within its overall priority considerations, and subject to certain reservations and conditions. I am pleased to forward herewith the conclusions and recommendations of the TAC on this matter, along with the full report of the panel.

We suggest that these documents be circulated to the CGIAR members and that this item be placed on the agenda for CGIAR consideration at its next meeting to be held in Paris 3 and 4 May 1979.

Respectfully submitted,

Ralph W. Cummings  
Chairman, TAC
CONSULTATIVE GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TAC CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
ON THE INCLUSION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE (IFPRI)
IN THE CGIAR SYSTEM

TAC Secretariat
March 1979
Additional copies of this document may be obtained from the TAC Secretariat
c/o FAO Liaison Office for North America
1776 F Street, NW, Washington, DC, U.S.A. 20437

Cable: FOODAGRI WASHINGTON DC
At its last meeting in November 1978, the CGIAR requested the advice of TAC on the candidature of IFPRI for inclusion in the CGIAR System. A mission was mounted by TAC to visit IFPRI in January 1979 (9-12) after consultations with the members of the CGIAR and TAC on the terms of reference and the list of questions to be addressed by the mission. The findings and recommendations of the mission were reported to TAC at its 21st Meeting (13-20 February 1979). The Director of the Institute, Dr J. Mellor, participated in the discussions of the Committee in open session and gave the views of the Institute on the report of the mission, generally agreeing with its findings and recommendations.

TAC then formulated its conclusions and recommendations in two stages. It first considered the rationale and the conditions for the inclusion of IFPRI in the CGIAR System and then, having generally agreed on a favourable recommendation, it considered the relative priority of this CGIAR initiative as compared to others which were examined by TAC concurrently.

(1) As to the rationale and the conditions for the inclusion of IFPRI in the CGIAR System, TAC generally endorsed the findings and recommendations of its mission panel and requested that the report of the mission be transmitted to the CGIAR. The mission report (AGD/TAC:IAR/79/5) is attached to this note. The comments and recommendations of the TAC on this report are recorded as part of the minutes of the 21st Meeting.

The TAC wishes to call particular attention to the following:

(i) TAC recognized that the mandate of IFPRI in its present formulation was very broad and could be read and interpreted in many different ways. The way this mandate was translated in actual programmes was of crucial importance in determining the degree of concurrence of objectives between the CGIAR and IFPRI. TAC recommended that, from the point of view of CGIAR support, the mandate of the Institute should give its principal emphasis to the problems of developing countries and that the central tasks in its programme should be concerned with the linkages and inter-relationships between the micro-level problems of the adoption of new technologies and the wider economic and socio-economic aspects of agricultural development. Thus the work on trends analysis and international food trade should be considered only as supporting activities to the main research programme. The Committee also considered that more emphasis should be given to the collaboration with national institutes in developing countries and to the possibilities of useful interaction with ISNAR. The Committee therefore recommended that IFPRI re-examine its mandate in the light of the above considerations.

These covered also a review of earlier discussions by TAC and the CGIAR on IFPRI. See Report of the 21st TAC meeting, agenda item 8.
The relationships between IFPRI and other international institutions were also considered by TAC. There is a potential conflict between the role of IFPRI as a research organization and as a servicing institution. Many organizations, the CGIAR in particular, are likely to expect IFPRI to respond to their special needs and demands. A more secure funding would certainly help IFPRI to respond to these demands in a more selective and independent manner, keeping in mind the priorities and the integration of its activities. TAC invited IFPRI to pursue its efforts in defining its complementarity to many other institutions such as FAO, World Bank, WFC, GATT, UNCTAD, OECD, particularly in regard to its work on trend analysis. It was suggested that after consultations IFPRI may establish agreements or memoranda of understanding with some of these institutions so as to define better their respective roles and their cooperation.

IFPRI was also invited to pursue similar consultations for its cooperation with the IARCs and with ISNAR. IFPRI could certainly be of great help to the CGIAR, TAC and the IARCs in tackling some complex problems such as those of equity in distribution of research benefits and providing broader perspective analysis which could have an important bearing on the overall priorities for and approaches to international research. IFPRI also could play an important role in helping ISNAR to analyze the food and agriculture problems of a country as a basis for planning and strengthening agricultural research in the country.

It was suggested that a large part of the above cooperative work of IFPRI with other institutions should continue to be carried out on a selective, contractual basis.

(iii) TAC also discussed the question of the location of IFPRI Headquarters. The panel had recommended that IFPRI give serious attention to the need to move the site of the Institute to a developing country for four main reasons. The first one was that an LDC environment was considered more appropriate for a research staff working on the problems of food shortage and hunger. The second reason was the need for IFPRI not to be considered as having a privileged status in the CGIAR System because of its present location. The third point in favour of a location in an LDC was to protect the Institute from undue influences of donors and to avoid that its work be perceived by others as being subject to these influences. The need for the Institute to avoid being used as a policy advisory body of international institutions, such as the CGIAR and the World Bank, was seen by the panel as the fourth reason justifying a location in a developing country.

TAC also heard the views of the Director of IFPRI that a precipitous move would be detrimental to the continuity of the work of the Institute. It would result in a staff turnover which could reflect upon the quality of the research carried out by the Institute in the near-term future. Moreover, a change in the directorship (a year ago) should not be
followed immediately by a change of location. The Director, therefore, would prefer that this transfer take place in three to four years from now, by which time he would have firmly established priorities, programmes, methods of work of the Institute and its cooperation with other Institutions.

The Committee endorsed the recommendation of the panel that IFPRI should be located in a developing country. The Committee realized that this transfer cannot be implemented immediately, but its importance justified a recommendation that the Consultative Group when granting its financial support to IFPRI should have a sufficient assurance from the Board that it would be actually effected and this as soon as possible.

(iv) Assuming that the Board of the Institute would be ready to examine favourably these recommendations and make them effective, the Committee strongly recommended a favourable consideration by the Group of the inclusion of IFPRI in the CGIAR System.

(2) In a second stage, TAC considered the relative priority of a CGIAR initiative in support of IFPRI as compared to other demands placed on the resources made available by the Group regarding ongoing activities and other new initiatives to fill other important gaps in international agricultural research. The following extracts of the revised document of TAC on priorities for international support to agricultural research in developing countries, indicate the position taken by the Committee in this respect.

(i) "TAC recommends that CGIAR resources be directed first towards assuring the continued support of the IARCs and other related activities* already established by the group ...."

(ii) "Subject to the fulfillment of the above requirements, TAC recommends that additional resources be directed by the CGIAR towards selected new initiatives or activities which fill the most important gaps in the established priority framework. Five subject areas have been identified in this category. These are in order of priority: tropical vegetable research; water management research; plant pest and disease physiology and ecology; food policy research; aquaculture research. New initiatives in these areas would call generally for activities which are distinct from those of the existing IARCs and therefore require the addition of new institutions to the CGIAR system. These institutions have been identified by TAC for two of the above five topics: tropical vegetable research and food policy research, for which TAC has elaborated specific proposals for consideration by the Group. The other three topics have been identified only in terms of the importance of the research gaps to be filled. TAC intends to pursue its examination of the institutional mechanisms required for CGIAR support in these three subject areas."

* IBPGR, WARDA, ISNAR
REPORT OF TAC MISSION TO IFPRI

(9-12 January 1979)

Washington, D.C.
18 Jan. 1979
13 January 1979

Dear Dr Cummings,

I take pleasure in transmitting to you the draft report of the TAC Mission to IFPRI which took place on 9-12 January 1979. As you know, the analytical part of the report has been copied to the Director of IFPRI for comments as to the accuracy of the factual information it contains.

In view of the short time available before the TAC meeting, the draft report is being circulated concurrently to the Members of TAC.

Yours sincerely,

Carl Christian Thomsen

Dr Ralph W. Cummings
Chairman
Technical Advisory Committee
812 Rosemont Avenue
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607
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I. INTRODUCTION

1. In September 1978, the three members of the CGIAR that have been the founders and supporters of IFPRI made a formal request on behalf of the Board of Trustees of the Institute that the group resume its consideration of including IFPRI in the CGIAR system. The joint letter to the Chairman of the CGIAR from the founders of IFPRI (The Ford Foundation, IDRC and the Rockefeller Foundation) is attached as Appendix I.

2. The Consultative Group considered this request at its meeting in November 1978. Although the establishment of a food policy research institute had been recommended to the CC by the Technical Advisory Committee in July 1974, no consensus was reached at that time in the Group. Three members of the Group however agreed to act as private sponsors in establishing the Institute and providing financial support for the first years of its activity. In discussing the application of IFPRI, the Consultative Group considered it necessary that TAC examine further this application in the light of the experience gained and the progress made in the first years of operation of the Institute. To this end, the Secretariat of TAC was requested to organize a Mission to visit IFPRI and report its findings to the 21st Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee in February 1979.

3. Draft Terms of Reference and a preliminary list of questions to be addressed by the TAC Mission were circulated for comments and suggestions to the members of the CGIAR and TAC in December 1978. Terms of Reference as revised in the light of comments received are reproduced below.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

(1) To gain a full understanding of the stated objectives of IFPRI and determine the extent to which these are in line with the declared objectives and policies of the CGIAR, taking into account the views expressed by TAC on this subject at its 7th and 8th meetings.

(2) To review the past and present work and future programmes of IFPRI and to ascertain the extent to which they meet the criteria established by TAC for consideration of the suitability of specific activities for CGIAR support.

(3) To assess the role and comparative advantages of IFPRI's past and potential contributions in the context of the overall requirements for socio-economic research in the field of food and agriculture and of the ongoing research in these fields by national and international institutions such as FAO and the IARCs and to determine the complementarity and relative priority of these activities.
(4) To gain an understanding of the governance, organization and mode of operation of IFPRI including its cooperative activities with LDCs, TARC's and other international institutions and to ascertain whether these are in conformity with the established practices of the TARC's supported by the CGIAR.

(5) On the basis of the above, to make a report for the 21st meeting of TAC including recommendations as to the suitability, or otherwise, of IFPRI for full membership in the CGIAR system and, if appropriate, indicating those parts of the activities of the Institute, if any, which may be granted CGIAR support (core-funding) and those adjustments which may be required in the Institute's charter, its programme and mode of operation (including financial aspects) to grant this support.

The list of questions is presented in Appendix II.

4. The leadership of the Mission was entrusted to Professor Carl Thomsen, Member of TAC, Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University of Copenhagen. Other members of the Mission were: Dr R. Barker, Professor, Cornell University Department of Agricultural Economics; Dr C. Hanumantha Rao, Director, Institute of Economic Growth, New Delhi; Dr E. Venezian, Director and Professor, Universidad Catolica de Chile, Department of Agricultural Economics; and, Mr P.J. Mahler, Executive Secretary of TAC, acted as Secretary for the Mission.

5. The Team assembled in Washington on the 8th of January 1979 and visited IFPRI on the 9th to 12th January. The Programme of the Mission is attached as Appendix III.

II. REVIEW OF TAC AND CGIAR DISCUSSION ON IFPRI

6. In discussing the priorities for international support to agricultural research, TAC recognized since its inception that the Group should sponsor research activities involving disciplines not only in the field of biological sciences but social sciences as well. TAC identified three levels of socio-economic research in which international support was required in the field of agriculture: a micro-level (farm and village level), where the international agricultural research centres needed to know more about the factors affecting the adoption and transferability of agricultural technology; a macro-level (national) where there was a need for improved knowledge and experience in the process of national policy formulation and planning not only in specific commodity sectors but also in the whole range of other aspects of agricultural development and investment; a global level where better information and understanding of the nature of the international problems affecting agricultural development as a basis for negotiation and collective decisions.
7. TAC recognized that a large part of the international research programmes required at the micro-level could be incorporated within the commodity programmes and farming system research programmes of the IARCs, and the activities of the Centres in this field were strengthened over the years accordingly. Important gaps however remain which could not be covered by international research institutions dealing with specific commodities and farming system research in selected regions.

8. The need for some new institutional initiative to fill the gaps in international socio-economic research for agricultural development was first discussed at a Bellagio meeting in 1973 at which a proposal was presented to establish a series of regional institutions with relatively small core staff working in cooperation with national staff on selected socio-economic problems of agricultural development and assisting in the formulation of national policies and plans. The meeting did not reach a conclusion on this proposal and recommended that TAC study further the need for a CGIAR initiative in this field.

9. The successive steps in the discussion by TAC and the CGIAR have been summarized in the letter requesting the inclusion of IFPRI in the CGIAR system and in the attachments to this letter which give relevant excerpts of the reports of TAC and CGIAR meetings. (See Appendix I.)

10. In reviewing the background documentation, the Panel has also taken into account the original proposal for a world food policy institute elaborated by a subcommittee of TAC and subsequently endorsed by TAC. The main features of this proposal are summarized under para. 14.

III. THE MANDATE OF IFPRI

11. The objectives of IFPRI as stated in the founding meeting of the Board of Trustees in May 1975 were as follows:

"Objectives of the Institute.

(1) Using all available sources of information, to provide an objective analysis of the current and prospective world food situation and the implications of this analysis for policy makers giving special emphasis to the needs of developing countries.

(2) to identify major opportunities for expanding world food production, giving emphasis to development actions and policies best suited to reducing constraints on production, and to establishing a framework for the sustained use of the agricultural production capacities which exist in low-income nations;

to determine and publicize those actions which could be undertaken, and those policies which could be adopted by governments, regional and international agencies, to effect a continued increase in the quantity of and quality of food supplies available to all people through enhanced food production, wider trade opportunities, and improved efficiency and equity in food distribution.

In order to achieve these objectives it is suggested that the Institute have two closely related functions:

(1) research on selected policy problems affecting the production and consumption of food throughout the world, and

(2) an information programme for national and international policy makers which blends the results of the research findings with an analysis of the current and prospective situation. This would be done in ways which better inform policy makers of the implications of alternative policy choices, especially as they relate to problems of developing countries."

"Turning to the training function, it is expected, as the TAC Subcommittee recommended, that IFPRI will have no formal training programme. The training activities would consist largely of learning by participating in multidisciplinary policy research. This relates to the proposed high proportion of non-permanent staff. These individuals may vary widely in experience and seniority, and most of them will return to positions where they do policy research or are involved in the policy process of their organizations or countries."

12. The statement of objectives was discussed and approved after slight modification, at the first full Board Meeting of the Institute in July 1975. In the interim (June 1975) IFPRI had been offered a grant by IDRC. The letter transmitting this offer (a copy of which was given to the TAC Review Mission) contained the following directive as to the use of its grant.

"to provide for the establishment of IFPRI and to enable IFPRI to undertake research on selected policy problems affecting the production, consumption, availability and equitable distribution of food in the world with particular emphasis on the needs of the low income countries and especially the needs of vulnerable groups within those countries. Specifically, IFPRI would work

a) to identify major opportunities for expanding world food production with particular emphasis on the development actions and policies best suited to remove present constraints to production and to establish the framework for the sustained use of the potential agricultural capacities existing in low-income nations;
b) to determine and publicize those actions which could be undertaken, and those policies which could be adopted by governments, regional and international agencies, to effect a continued increase in the quantity and quality of food supplies available to all people through enhanced food production, wider trade; and

c) to provide information, and expanded base of knowledge and objective analysis of world food problems, and to indicate the opportunities and options open for their solution."

13. This has subsequently been considered as effectively defining the broad mandate and objectives of the Institute. It will be seen that it corresponds broadly with the objectives suggested in the prospectus, but puts less emphasis on the early warning role implied in point (1) of those objectives. The Board has supported this modification, and also the statement on training in the prospectus.

14. In its initial proposal for the establishment of a world food policy institute, the Subcommittee which had been established by TAC for this purpose recommended that the Institute be given the following functions:

(i) Research

"a) To keep the current global food and agricultural situation under independent surveillance (supply, demand, stocks, and short-term outlook for the major agricultural products, as well as fertilizer and other inputs, price and trade developments and prospects).

Its main source of intelligence for this purpose would be secondary data, drawn from FAO, IBRD, and other appropriate bodies, but utilizing both published and unpublished information.

b) To examine selected major food and agricultural policy and trade problems, particularly those involving sensitive relationships between and among countries, e.g., distribution of fertilizer or other inputs in short supply; food and other aid policies; cartels and their implications; export policies of major producers; trade preferences, trade barriers, and other effects of policies adopted by developed countries on the agriculture of developing countries.

This research would be done in cooperation with other international agencies and national institutions, and the results would be fed into the outlook and information activities of the Institute. A particular objective would be to help national planners identify the possible impact of problems or actions arising outside their countries on their internal economies and policies."
c) To identify and research emerging and future problems of global concern likely to have an important bearing on food production and utilization (including competition between supplies for food and feed) in the longer term.

A major objective of these studies would be to indicate the actions needed in the next few years to gear up for better resource allocation and management and to improve productivity and food availability in the long run. The Subcommittee were of the opinion that this aspect of development policy is currently receiving inadequate attention both vis-a-vis short-term emergency action and long-term perspective planning ...."

"Studies would either have to be undertaken on a task force basis by teams of research fellows and associates, and/or by subcontracting to appropriate universities or other research institutions. The "core" staff of the Institute, in addition to participation where feasible, would have an important 'think tank' role in identifying researchable topics, screening for priority, and working out methodology in collaboration with members of the task force. There is also a clear need to associate staff of the International Research Centres, and of the agencies of the UN system in such studies, both to give the broad input of inter-disciplinary expertise and experience of developing countries required to supplement the background of the Institute's staff, and because the output of the Institute, if it has its feet firmly on the ground, ought to be highly relevant to their own policies and programmes."

(ii) Information

"An important task of the Institute must be to transmit up-to-date and relevant information on the world food situation and outlook to national policy makers. This would be done through regular periodic publications, seminars, workshops, and the device of an annual food outlook conference."

"The Subcommittee envisaged the Institute as having two main annual publications, supplemented by special research monographs as an outcome of its task force activities. These two publications would be:

a) An annual World Agricultural Policy Review - highlighting the components of agricultural policy in major producing countries or groups of countries, which might have significant effects on the short-term world food situation, as well as internally to those countries. This would be, inter alia, an attempt to define likely trouble spots related to food supply, input availability, etc.
b) An annual Outlook on Food and Agriculture related to a longer
time horizon and a broader perspective. This would incorporate
and draw conclusions from the special studies of the Institute,
as well as from analysis and critical appraisal of other
relevant research such as that undertaken by FAO, UNRISD, IBRD,
and the Club of Rome. It would examine issues such as future
availability of production requisites (e.g., who is building
new fertilizer capacity, where, what types, and with what
resources based), and the probable impact on price and availability
of inputs; it would draw attention to new agricultural technology
and its implications (e.g., high lysine sorghum); it might
review the inter-relationships between population, income growth
and distribution, demand for food, and the incidence of mal-
nutrition, and so on."

(iii) Training

"As indicated earlier, the Institute is not seen by the Subcommittee
as having a formal training role; but a limited number of graduate
research associates from developing countries (probably around 10 in
any one year) would be working as part of its research staff and would
in effect be receiving "in-service" training in this way. Their
experience would also be invaluable in helping to ensure the relevance
of the work of the Centre to the key problems affecting the food and
nutrition situation in the developing countries."

"A further contribution to training would be the programme of
problem-oriented seminars and workshops, which is foreseen as an
important part of the Institute's study programme and 'think-tank'
role, and which might be conducted, at least in part, in locations
outside the Institute's headquarters where typical problem situations
could be studied 'in situ' and local staff involved."

15. In discussing this proposal, TAC made several amendments taking
into account the need to avoid duplication and overlapping with the activities
of other institutions, in particular, the responsibilities of FAO in publishing
annual reports on the state of Food and Agriculture. It also considered
various alternatives and possible locations whereby a close association of
the Institute with FAO could be facilitated while maintaining an independence
and autonomy in research and in the assessment of the food policy problems.

16. The final proposal by TAC to the CGIAR listed the following
objectives:

"a) To keep the global food and agriculture situation under
independent review and analysis with respect to such
matters as supply and demand, stocks, supply of inputs,
price and trade developments and prospects. It would use
the primary data gathered by the FAO, World Bank, U.S.
Department of Agriculture and other major agencies, together
with information from the international agricultural research
system.
b) To select key policy issues for analysis. The Institute would examine major agricultural policies and trade problems relating to food, particularly those involving sensitive relationships between governments (for example, the distribution of fertilizer and other inputs in short supply). Such studies would help national planners to assess the possible impact on their own economies of conditions arising outside their own countries and to formulate appropriate policies.

c) To identify research needs which bore on world food production and use: for example the use of the land resources of South America for meat production, and the opening of new territories such as the Amazon basin.

d) To transmit its findings to policy makers, among other means, by seminars and workshops.

e) To work largely through task forces and subcontracting of research projects. The central staff would provide guidance on priorities and methodology for the various task forces. The Institute would therefore need to have close relationships with existing research institutes so as to develop teams which would work on particular problems."

16. The ensuing discussions by the CGIAR concentrated on the rationale\(^1\) for the establishment of the Institute in the context of the work already being carried out by FAO and did not lead to specific proposals for amending the list of objectives set by TAC for this institution. The Consultative Group generally supported the idea of establishing an international research institute on food policies but was not prepared to take a collective commitment of support to this proposal at a time when a wide range of new initiative were under discussion in the context of the World Food Conference.

17. The objectives produced by the TAC Subcommittee and subsequently by TAC are in general similar to those established by the Board of IFPRI in particular as regards the main functions of monitoring of the world food situation, identification and analysis of specific food policy issues, dissemination of research findings on these issues to policy makers. There is also a full concurrence between the views of TAC and those of the Board as to the very limited role which IFPRI should play in the field of training.

18. There are however some slight differences in the emphasis placed on the main objectives and functions of the Institute. The formulation of objectives as proposed by TAC stressed somewhat the role of monitoring and analysis of the world food situation, identification of research needs and the role of the Institute in promoting research by other institutions through

\(^1\)See the excerpts of records of the CGIAR meetings as given in the attachments to the offer of application given in Appendix I.
task forces and subcontracts. The objectives of IFPRI as established by Board seem to emphasize more the active role which the Institute would play in recommending specific actions and policies. These objectives also stress more the concerns for equity and for the low-income countries.

19. The Panel notes, however, that the significance of these differences in the formulation of the objectives very much depend on the interpretation given to the mandate and on its translation into programmes of activities. These aspects are discussed in Chapter VII of the report.

IV. ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

20. Under the leadership of the Director and Deputy Director, IFPRI's overall research programme is administered through four units which delineate the major elements which have a bearing on food policies:

(i) **Trends Analysis** - to gauge the size and nature of the world food problem;

(ii) **Production Policy** - to understand how to raise the growth rate of agricultural production and the various linkages effects of growth;

(iii) **Consumption Policy** - to understand how increased food supplies can be effectively utilized to meet growth and equity objectives; and

(iv) **Trade Policy** - to understand the role of international trade in meeting food needs.

21. Each of the above programme areas corresponds to an organizational unit which is led by a Programme Director. In addition, IFPRI has an administrative Unit, and a Communications Unit (Library, Documentation and Publication).

22. IFPRI has not established an organizational unit for training, as many IARCs have, in line with the TAC recommendations that "the Institute should have a limited training role probably involving mainly graduate level research associates plus a few fellowships available for in-house research activities."

23. Similarly, IFPRI has not established a special organizational unit to administer collaborative programmes or "outreach activities". These are being carried out by the research units concerned either individually or by means of a special project involving personnel from several research units.

---

1 This role was, however, also stressed in the original proposal of the TAC subcommittee as indicated in para. 14.
24. For the moment the total staff is based in Washington and holds contracts which vary in duration from 1 to 5 years according to the position held. IFPRI is contemplating on outposting a limited number of staff in some regions as its programme would require. For example, the IRRI/IPDC collaboration calls for a person in Southeast Asia. Over the longer run it would probably be desirable to station four to six out of a staff of 25 outside of headquarters. Temporary detailment of few months' duration, as it is already the case for some of the research projects, would also continue.

25. As regards recruitment of personnel, IFPRI can claim that its staff is as international in character as any other IARCs in the CGIAR system. More than two thirds of the staff comes from developing countries and this ratio is even higher among the resident researchers1 (81.5%) than for the visiting researchers (62.5%) and research assistants (45.4%), whereas it is usually the reverse in the IARCs.

26. The recruitment procedures are flexible in that no systematic attempt has been made so far to advertise widely the vacancies. The Trustees and the senior staff, by the very nature of their qualifications, have been able to identify and select a staff with a wide diversity of experiences both in research and in policy-making in developing countries.

27. The Panel recognizes that the number of people with experience in food policy research in developing countries is limited and that IFPRI probably has established contacts with most of the institutions where such people are working and from which it can recruit its personnel. It would, however, encourage IPPRI in continuing its present attempt to give wider scope to its recruitment.

28. The Panel also noted that IPPRI may have a significant turnover in its research staff. It feels that this turnover, if kept within reasonable limits, is probably beneficial to an institute which is in continuous need for new independent ideas and innovative research in food policies. It also recognized that this turnover of staff may assist IPPRI in having a greater impact on the policies of other international and national institutions if an interchange of personnel takes place between these institutions and IPPRI.

29. The location of IFPRI had been debated a number of times in the TAC and the CGIAR. Initially, a location in Rome had been contemplated as a means to place IFPRI closer to the major international institutions dealing with the food problems (FAO, WFP, and now WFC and IFAD).

30. The pros and cons of locating the Institute in a developing or a developed country, and also which country, were discussed a good deal by the founders of IFPRI and Washington was deemed to offer the broadest resource base. A recent poll of IPPRI's international staff confirms their view that this was the optimum choice. It was considered that the type of

1Research fellows and associates.
intellectual and statistical base needed for an institute with IFPRI's mandate and modus operandi would probably be difficult to find in many developing or developed countries outside Europe or North America.

31. IFPRI recognizes, however, that in principle there is no outstanding reason why it could not operate from a developing country, provided the CGIAR saw it as being more usefully located in that way, subject to the same sort of qualifications concerning access by air, housing, schooling and services which are applied to other international centres. There would be little problem in moving and relatively modest expense because the Institute does not have any significant capital assets.

32. The Panel examined the rationale for the location in Washington as presented by IFPRI. It recognizes certain advantages in the presence of other international organizations, such as the World Bank, the CGIAR in Washington, the access to USDA data base, the proximity to a number of leading universities of North America involved in socio-economic research on developing countries' problems. It recognizes the validity of the reasons given for the choice made by the founders of the Institute. The Panel, however, feels that access to data bases is not an overriding consideration. Furthermore, the Panel considers that the Institute, in order to retain sufficient independence and identity in its research work, should not be too closely associated with the intergovernmental institutions dealing with food and agriculture. The Panel believes it important that the Board and the management of IFPRI examine further the possible problems which the location of the Institute in a country which has a major role on the international scene in the field of food and agriculture may create for the Institute in establishing its credibility as an independent institution. The Panel had no evidence of any influence of the host country on the position taken by the Institute regarding certain food problems and policies, but it was concerned that developing countries may find it difficult to perceive and recognize the independence and objectivity of an institute analyzing their problems and their policies while being based in a country which is a major power of the developed world.

33. The Panel recognizes also that IFPRI has assembled a staff which before forming IFPRI has been exposed and continue to be exposed to the conditions of developing countries by its travel and by its cooperation with institutions located in developing countries. It feels, however, that should IFPRI have been located in a developing country, the IFPRI staff would perceive the actual nature of the problems of the developing countries in their day-to-day life and this could possibly help them in making their research work more relevant and their policy analysis more realistic. Being located in a developing country, IFPRI may, however, have faced some of the problems experienced by other IARCs in establishing a balance in satisfying the demands of its host country and those of other countries.
34. The Board of Trustees is composed of agricultural policy makers, leading economists and agricultural scientists, half of them from developing countries. There are trustees from the three major donors and at present from U.K., France and Australia. The Director of IFPRI does not see any difficulty in having a majority of its Board appointed by the CGIAR.

35. The Board assumes the usual functions of governance of the Institute. It approves its programme and budget as submitted by the Director. The programme and budget are developed through a process of formulation which has been recently more decentralized within the Institute.

36. IFPRI staff carries on a continuing internal and external dialogue as to research priorities. In the fall of each year the research programme is examined and preparation made for the February Board Meeting at which the programme is discussed, agreement made and the programme finalized. In 1979 the February Board Meeting will be held in Rome to allow full discussions with FAO as to the efficacy of the proposed programmes. The Board will also consider an expanded and more regularly meeting Programme Committee. Now that IFPRI is maturing, it would be useful for the Institute to consider the possibility of joint meetings with the economists in the IARCs to discuss interaction of research programmes on policy issues.

37. The Director is assisted by an Advisory Committee composed of the Directors of Research Programmes, the Director of Administration and the Information Services Director, on various administrative and policy issues of the Institute.

38. An Information Services Committee advises the Director of Information Services on the various issues related to the programme and a Publications Review Committee reviews manuscripts for publication and appoints reviewers to assist in its work. A Statistical Service group advises the Director of Statistical Service on the needs of the other research programmes and their priorities.

39. The Panel recognizes the difficulties faced by the Institute in establishing a programme structure and priorities in a field where linkages and interactions are the main focus of research. The demarcation lines among the programmes on production, distribution and trade are blurred and somewhat arbitrary since in fact most of the research projects within these programmes are concerned with inter-relationships between these areas. The links between some of the programme elements are not always evident because the Institute tries to fill specific knowledge gaps in a field where several other research institutions and universities are also working. The role of the management in IFPRI is obviously crucial in setting priorities, selecting specific research projects and resisting pressures from its staff and other organizations regarding requests and opportunities for research on the multiple aspects of the food problems.
40. The Panel noted that the management of the Institute fully recognizes the risk of developing a set of ad hoc research projects in response to opportunities and requests from other institutions. Steps are being taken to undertake more systematic surveys of research needs through consultations with the multiple potential users of the research output of IFPRI (IARCs, international and national institutions). This should enable IFPRI to set priorities among the needs of its potential clients and possibly develop a programme structure centred around a limited number of research problem areas. In so doing, IFPRI should maintain its present policy of formulating a research programme which corresponds to its own perception and assessment of the world food problems and of the research needs and which does not necessarily meet the requirements nor recognizes the priorities of other institutions. Should IFPRI be included in the CGIAR system, however, its Board may have to reassess the priorities between the contributions which IFPRI could make to the diverse components of the CG system (the IARCs, TAC and the CG itself) and national agricultural research on the one hand as against the broader policy analyses which IFPRI was set up to carry out on the other hand. This reassessment of the priorities and of the interpretation of the mandate may be all the more necessary since a more secure funding could also enable the centre a longer term perspective in its objectives and its programme planning.

41. The Panel also examined other aspects of the organization and management of IFPRI as regards its categories of personnel, its recruitment policies, its salary structure and budget. It noted that the categories of personnel established are very similar to those used by other IARCs. It was also informed that IFPRI administration would not have difficulties in following the several guidelines established in the CGIAR system for the presentation of the programme of work and budget and accounting. The administrative unit had detailed proposals as regards the categories of personnel and salary structures taking into account those used in the U.S. government administration, in U.S. universities and the IARCs. The Board examined these proposals in 1978 together with the job descriptions and job analysis prepared by the Director of Administration.

V. REVIEW OF PROGRAMME AREAS

42. The research work of IFPRI is divided administratively into four main programme areas - Trends Analysis, Production Policy, Consumption Policy and Trade Policy. However, much of the research work cuts across two or more of these areas because of the emphasis on an integrated approach to food policy problems.

A. Trends Analysis

43. The Trends Analysis programme is providing independent assessments of the prospective world food situation with special emphasis on the food problems of the developing countries. Research activities centre on analysis of the historical trends of food production and consumption in these countries and making projections of their future food needs, using specified assumptions of the growth of population and per capita income.
44. These assessments together with an examination of major factors underlying production and consumption trends, provide the context for other research workers of the Institute in their evaluations of national and international food policy changes. It is also of value to the work of international organizations as the World Food Council, the World Bank and FAO as well as to national policy groups.

(a) Food gap analysis

45. Based largely on data from the USDA, IFPRI has undertaken two assessments of the future food situation in the developing market economy countries. The first study was released in a 1976 report entitled Food Needs in the Developing World: Location and Magnitude of the Task in the Next Decade and projected cereal production and demand in these countries up to 1985. In 1977 the scope of this report was updated and widened in Food Needs of Developing Countries: Projections and Consumption to 1980, which included three major staple foods as well as cereals. A third assessment of the prospective world food situation which is planned for release in 1980, will make projections to the year 2000. Research on the People's Republic of China and possibly other Asian centrally planned economies, will be included in this work, which will form an input to the corresponding FAO project. In connection with this new assessment there will be a shift of primary reliance on data from USDA to those from FAO.

(b) Production trends in selected rapid-growth developing countries

46. The Trends Analysis Programme is collaborating with the Production Policy Programme in a comparative study of the major components of increased food output in 16 developing market economy countries selected to shed light on sources of high growth rates.

(c) Comparative study of FAO and USDA food production data

47. The gap analysis work has noted differences between USDA and FAO country data on production and area of food crops. Efforts are made to measure and analyze these differences with a view to their reconciliation, for the purpose of future studies. This will also enable the Institute as a user of data to contribute in a dialogue with FAO and USDA to their current efforts in this respect.

(d) Methodology improvement

48. The estimation methods themselves are also being refined. Rather than simply estimating historical trends, future projections will attempt to remove the effects of extreme weather and try to identify changes in trends during the observation period.
49. The Trends Analysis Programme also conducts research in conjunction with other programme areas. Collaborative work is being undertaken with the Trade Policy Programme on the trends of food imports and exports in developing countries and plans for joint projects with the Production Policy and the Consumption and Distribution Policy Programmes are being developed.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE PANEL

50. The work under this programme area has more the character of a supporting activity to the other programme areas, but it also provides a basis for problem identification and quantification. The emphasis is on longer term perspective studies and there is need for a continuous monitoring of the data material including analysis of possible discrepancies in this material. It provides a possibility for challenging the official statistics where needed, as well as allowing for the introduction of alternative assumptions in the projections compared to the approach of other institutes. The programme also enables the Institute to undertake new and independent groupings or classifications of data by groups of countries, ecological zones, etc. It is recognized that there is no need nor scope for the building up of an early warning system in addition to that provided by the FAO. It is also noted that there is no intention to prepare annual or periodic reports on the world food situation and outlook as a result of the work in this programme.

B. Production and Investments Programme

51. The Production and Investments Programme, in terms of numbers of staff presently involved, is the largest in the Institute. The programme is still very much in the formative stage. It consists of three elements: (i) production policy, (ii) production strategy, and (iii) growth linkages. The research priorities within the first two categories reflect the need to understand the alternative policies and strategies that will help to raise the rate of growth in food production and close the projected gap between production and consumption. The research priorities within the third category reflect the need to examine alternative production and food policies in the wider setting of agricultural and economic development policies and strategies.

(a) Production policy

52. The initial thrust of research in this area was on investment requirements (Investment Requirements to Increase Food Production, Research Report #12, forthcoming) and on allocation of resources to agricultural research (Allocation of Resources to Agricultural Research: International Research Priorities, Research Report #9, forthcoming). This work is being followed up by focus on price policy and on three key inputs, agricultural research, irrigation, and fertilizer that bring about a shift in the agricultural supply function.
(b) Production strategy

53. The research in this area deals with the trade-offs in the employment of scarce fiscal and physical resources with the object of identifying optimal production strategies. Projects currently underway include the analysis of government budget allocation to agriculture over time in Latin American countries, and the analysis of the trade-offs between export crops, domestic food crops, and livestock in the Sahelian countries.

(c) Growth linkages

54. IFPRI views technological change as a prime mover not only in closing the gap in food deficits in developing countries, but also in the broader context of accelerating agricultural and economic development. There is increasing concern that raising food production growth rates leads to the sharp decline in food grain prices in the absence of programmes designed to stimulate effective demand (build up purchasing power) among the poorer segments of the economy. Two projects are now being initiated: (i) to empirically quantify the relationships that exist along growth or development patterns between agriculture and the rest of the economy, and (ii) to trace and evaluate this income-employment effect of agricultural growth. The concern of this latter study will be with the appropriateness of a development strategy from the standpoint of its alleviation of poverty.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE PANEL

55. The Panel concurs that food policy issues must be examined within the broader framework of agricultural and economic development policies. At the same time, the careful choice of priorities for research in this larger framework becomes even more critical. The substantive research findings to date seem to be in response to the demands of intergovernmental institutions for information. There is a need for more forward planning, a narrower defining of priorities, and the establishment of criteria for determining when a proposed project falls within the priorities established. In the absence of such an exercise, the focus on growth linkages permits almost any research undertaking to be viewed as an appropriate activity of the Production and Investments Programme area. In the establishment of priorities, it would be important to have a clear focus on certain areas or sets of countries where food policy research would seem to have the prospect of a particularly high pay off in relieving constraints to production and alleviating poverty. It would also be desirable to consider the balance among research activities in terms of the primary target groups or audiences: national institutions, CGIAR system, international institutions.

C. Food Consumption and Distribution Programme

56. This programme is evolving in keeping with the basic objectives of the IFPRI and as complementary to the Institute's research programmes on Trends, Production Policy and Trade and Food Security. Given the overall objective of the Institute to study the problems of food policy with particular reference to the food and nutritional needs of the poorer sections, the development of this research programme becomes necessary
for a number of important reasons. Experience has shown that reaching the
overall national targets of food production by itself is not sufficient to
ensure adequate consumption by the poor both because the prevailing
production processes do not necessarily generate the requisite incomes
for the poor and the existing distribution systems do not always prove
adequate for ensuring the necessary supplies to the poor, particularly in
shortage situations. The problem is, therefore, essentially one of shifting
the demand schedules as well as of effective management of available supplies.
This explains why in many of the low-income countries public distribution
systems for grains and dual price policy are becoming important instruments
of income redistribution and for ensuring supplies in times of critical
shortages, without adversely affecting incentives for production.

57. In studying the nutritional aspects of consumption by the poor, IFPRI
recognizes that its comparative advantage lies in focusing on energy protein
malnutrition problems at the household level for broad segments of the
population rather than on specific micro-nutrient deficiencies or inter-
household effects.

58. IFPRI's Research Report "Food Needs of Developing Countries: Projections
of Production and Consumption to 1990" provides the food gap projections, and
an assessment of food aid requirements is contained in "Programming United
States Food Aid to Meet Humanitarian and Developmental Objectives". These
reports represent the culmination of earlier efforts to estimate the size of
the calorie energy gap in the major countries and regions of the world and
the number of persons receiving inadequate calorie intakes for the years
1975 and 1985. IFPRI has also placed a major emphasis on evaluating the
consumption and nutrition consequences of food subsidy/ration schemes.
Individual country studies of the system have been made for Bangladesh,
Sri Lanka, and India, with concentration in the latter on operation of the
system in the state of Kerala, by using both household consumer survey data
and time series data.

59. The Panel also noted that IFPRI proposes to conduct a number of
important studies in this field. Changes in the commodity composition of
the consumption basket as income increases, e.g., the prospects for coarse
cereals in the dynamic context are proposed to be evaluated. The effects
of sudden increases in supplies on prices and the impact of food aid on
technological change via its effect on price incentives would also be
evaluated. IFPRI also recognizes the importance of investigating the
efficiency of alternative means of shifting the demand schedules, e.g.,
employment and wage-income oriented production programmes, non-agricultural
employment such as Rural Works Programmes, and outright price subsidies
for the grain distributed.
OBSERVATIONS OF THE PANEL

60. The World Food Programme and other international organizations interested in food problem treat the latter essentially as a humanitarian problem of meeting food and nutritional needs of certain targeted groups. IFPRI, on the other hand, is better fitted to approach the problem as one of shifting demand and effective management of supplies. Whereas interaction and cooperation with such international organizations, as also with national distribution systems, is necessary to get the data as well as insights, it is important to resist the demands from such organizations to have the performance of their individual programmes evaluated, as this would distract IFPRI's attention from its own task of conducting serious economic analyses of the problem.

61. Whereas this programme has undoubtedly a promise and needs to become an integral part of IFPRI research, the studies as such may have to become wider in scope in the sense of covering a range of alternatives as well as geographical areas. This requires interaction and collaboration particularly with other research centres in the system, including those at the national level, for collection and analysis of the relevant data and for field appraisals of the prevailing systems of distribution. This may also involve the employment of seed money by the IFPRI to organize studies in particular areas, in collaboration with other national centres.

D. Trade and Food Security Programme

62. The research on Trade and Food Security at IFPRI constitutes a broad programme, which, however, is being progressively focused more on issues that integrate with the Production and Consumption Programmes. There are two major areas in this research, one dealing with (1) international food policy issues, and the other with (2) domestic trade policy analysis. Within the first area, research falls under three general topics: (a) agricultural export prospects, (b) food security, and (c) food aid.

63. International trade and aid issues have a very important bearing on food production and consumption at the country level, and thus condition domestic policy alternatives related to food crops. The social welfare implications of this are severe, as the countries most vulnerable to international trade problems are precisely the lowest income, food deficit countries. Also, in all LDCs it is the large poor segments of the population that are most affected by instability in food supplies.

64. Most problems of trade and food security are beyond the control of simple developing countries, being international in nature. Furthermore, these countries have little research capacity to analyze the problem and advance sound policy options for themselves. IFPRI has thus a clear-cut valuable role to play in this situation: its independent research, geared to provide alternative policy choices, directed particularly at the lower income countries and peoples fills in a serious gap in research capability in the international scene.
65. IFPRI's trade research completed, in process, and planned, under the above categories is summarized in the following paragraphs.

(a) International food policy issues

66. Work at IFPRI in this area was initiated in 1976, giving special attention initially to issues related to agricultural commodity trade, expanding subsequently to questions of food security and aid, with particular reference to the least developed, food-deficit countries.

(i) Agricultural export prospects

67. Two studies have been completed and published on this topic, on the subjects "Commodity Trade Issues in International Negotiations" and "Potential of Agricultural Exports to Finance Increased Food Imports in Selected Developing Countries". These studies discuss alternative policy strategies, and point to the need for studies at the country level to better understand the relationship between trade policy and reducing food deficits. Also, a case study on "Growth Potential of the Beef Sector in the Economic Context of Latin America" was carried out, in conjunction with CIAT, which looks at the export potential for beef from Latin America to the OECD countries.

68. Presently, a study is in progress on "Potential Benefits of Agricultural Trade Liberalization," which aims at assessing the gains from alternative policies for trade liberalization by both developed and developing countries. This study is being done in collaboration with FAO's project for "Agricultural Towards the Year 2000".

69. Research is also underway to analyze the potential advantages for agricultural exports of LDCs from extension of the generalized System of Preferences of the OECD countries. The study will identify countries and products most likely to benefit from the greater access to developed country markets.

70. Another study is in the preliminary stages of planning, on the subject of "Closing the Food Gap with Commercial imports". This would assess the capacity of individual countries to increase commercial food imports to eliminate their projected deficits.

(ii) Food security

71. Research on this topic has focused on the problem of alleviating the danger of year-to-year fluctuations in food availability for the group of least developed, food deficit countries. A major study of an international scheme for food security was carried out, and published under the title, "Food Security: An Insurance Approach," which aimed specifically at stabilizing cereal consumption in these countries.
72. Work has been conducted also on defining a quantitative concept of food security, based on an index of several variables. This aims at a classification of countries and assessment of their vulnerability to changes in external markets.

73. IFPRI sponsored an international conference on "Food Security for Developing Countries," in conjunction with CIMMYT in 1978, from which a proceedings volume is being published. Four of the papers were contributed by Institute staff.

74. A major study is in process, on the problem of "Food Security in the Sahel" which analyzes schemes based on commodity and financial reserves, as well as possible contributions of food aid to the system. This research is being conducted in collaboration with the USDA and USAID.

75. Two additional studies have been planned for initiation in 1979. One is on the "Effect of an International Food Security Scheme on World Cereal Prices" and is being done at the request of the World Food Council. The other is on "Developed-Country Farm Policy Trends and their Impact on Developing Country Food Supplies."

(iii) Food aid

76. Following on the World Food Conference's conclusions regarding the severe food scarcity problem in several less developed countries, IFPRI carried out a comprehensive analysis of food aid, published as "Programming United States Food Aid to Meet Humanitarian and Developmental Objectives." This study was contributed to a Brookings Institution broader research on U.S. foreign aid strategy. The study stressed the relationship between food aid policies to increase domestic food production in the recipient countries.

77. Another study is underway for "Assessing Food Aid Requirements," which aims at refining analytical methodology and providing estimates of food aid needs of low income, food-deficit countries. The research involves estimation of the magnitude of food gaps, the portion of the deficit that can be covered with commercial imports, and determination of the food aid needs and interrelation with food security in these countries.

(b) Domestic trade policy analysis

78. This research area has received attention only more recently at IFPRI. One study is currently in process, on "Foreign Trade and Food Supply Policy in Colombia: Historical Analysis and Policy Simulations, 1966-1978" which is being conducted in cooperation with the University of the Andes, under a special grant from the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. The objective is to provide an analytical framework of economic policy for agriculture and their effects on food production and distribution. Special attention is given to welfare effects of policy variables on lower-income people.
79. Another study is being initiated on "Rice Policies in Southeast Asia: Approaches to Short-run Supply Management," which aims at measuring how far rice consumption can be assured via trade policies and management of stocks. This study is part of the larger collaborative project on rice policies in Southeast Asia, conducted by IFPRI, IRRI and IFDC.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE PANEL

80. The Panel commends IFPRI's substantial work in this programme, but sees a problem in the large scope and somewhat diffused focus of the research. It is recognized that this is due in part to the process of selection of subjects in relation to what research is done by other institutions; but it points however to a question of setting of priorities and criteria for confining IFPRI's activities more specifically to the interphase where international trade problems affect domestic production and consumption policies. In this same respect, the Panel feels that IFPRI must be careful not to structure its programme too much in response to requests for specific studies by international and other agencies.

81. The Panel considers that IFPRI's trade research is important also for the contribution it can make to the other international centres of the CG system. IFPRI's macro-economic, multi-country approach provides a view that goes beyond simple commodities, but which may bring out production policy problems at the local level that affect the adoption of new technology. The Panel therefore feels that closer collaboration between IFPRI and the other international centres should be encouraged.

E. Communications and Training

82. The Communications Programme has the major objective of developing information exchange levels with policy makers, administrators, national and international leaders in and outside government in developed and developing countries and to publicize and increase understanding of food policy alternatives at the national, regional and international levels. For this purpose, the Communications Programme works closely with the research programme of the Institute.

83. The programme endeavours to make available relevant information on food policy issues and progress in their solution through its publications and its work with national and international research and technical assistance organizations.

84. The other objective of the Communications Programme is to develop a continuing seminar and workshop activity to bring together research workers and policy makers to discuss key issues and policy alternatives and actions. During 1978 the Institute has sponsored a series of seminars which were largely based on ongoing research. Also in 1978, an international conference co-sponsored with CIMMYT was held at CIMMYT headquarters in Mexico, at which food security as a problem of developing food-deficit countries was explored on the basis of research conducted by the Trade Policy Programme. Participants included researchers and policy advisors in developing and developed countries.
A further important objective of the Communications Programme is to meet the information needs of the Institute's own research staff. The library is being developed to provide up-to-date information largely through periodicals and research reports from other institutions dealing with food policy, economic development and other related issues.

The Institute has no formal training programme, but research associates from the developing countries are in effect receiving on-the-job training during their period of work at the Institute.

The IFPRI report 1976-78 is with the printers and it is intended to publish the 1979 research programme of the Institute. It is also understood that in addition to the annual report there are plans to publish an annual Director's statement on food policy issues.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE PANEL

Considerations should be given to the need for translation of certain selected publications of the Institute into other languages so as to make them accessible to a wider audience. The preparation of a newsletter in several languages would also be worth considering.

VI. RELATIONS WITH CGIAR, OTHER INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

A. IFPRI and the CGIAR System

There is an important set of complementarities that exist between IFPRI and the CGIAR system. These can be described as follows. For IFPRI an understanding of the work of the international agricultural research centres in developing new technology and a clear perception of the physical potential of alternative technologies is essential in conducting the research on production policy programmes. While the focus of centres' research is on the micro-level problems of production, the centres generate a wealth of data that has important macro-level policy implications. But the centres generally lack both the resource and personnel to exploit the data for this purpose. The results of IFPRI research should be useful in identifying the way in which existing policies act as constraints to the adoption of new technology. Because IFPRI's research is not narrowly confined to a single commodity or set of commodities, IFPRI can provide useful information to assist the centres, the CG and TAC with the task of setting research priorities. To the degree that IFPRI is able to provide a clearer understanding of the growth linkages, this would strengthen the capacity of the CGIAR system to evaluate both the direct and indirect socio-economic consequences of the introduction of new or proposed technology.
Present Status

90. IFPRI has already taken steps to exploit the potential complementarities described above. Research Report #9 Allocation of Resources to Agricultural Research: International Research Priorities, prepared at the request of TAC, demonstrates IFPRI's capacity to provide useful information and interchange of ideas as an input into the TAC decision-making process.

91. The linkages between IFPRI and the centres are more difficult to establish because of the wide geographic dispersion of the centres. The process of evolving these linkages is necessarily slow and has been significantly delayed by the change in IFPRI directorship, but substantial progress has been made. The strongest ties at present exist between IFPRI and IRRI and it is worth commenting on this relationship. A research proposal Rice Policies in Southeast Asia has been submitted by IFPRI, IFDC and IRRI (Jan. 1979). The proposal calls for collaborative research among the centres and the four ASEAN rice producing countries on a broad set of issues dealing with rice production, consumption and trade. The initial initiative for the project came from IRRI who saw the need to understand more clearly the alternative measures and the policy constraints in achieving a shift of the rice supply function, but saw the scope of this research as falling well outside of its own capacity. The final project goes well beyond the initial IRRI perceptions to emphasize an understanding of growth linkages which IFPRI sees as essential in evaluating policy alternatives and constraints. This project provides an illustration of the potential depth and breadth of the IFPRI linkages with research at the centres.

92. Because of the wide diversity in the food production and policy problems and in the staff composition and research focus of the centres themselves, it is safe to assume that linkages between IFPRI and the other centres are unlikely to follow the format described in the research proposed on rice policies. Furthermore, there are a number of other ways in which IFPRI can usefully collaborate with the centres that would be less demanding in terms of budget and manpower requirements. CIAT has requested IFPRI assistance in evaluating its own research priorities. CIMMYT has interacted with IFPRI in sponsoring a conference on International Food Security. IFPRI sees itself as eventually taking a leadership role in interacting with the centre economists on research involving the interphase between technology and policy.

93. Finally, IFPRI's future relationship to ISNAR is envisioned as being similar to that with other centres. But IFPRI's strong interest in analyzing national research priorities can be seen as highly complementary to ISNAR's mission of strengthening national research systems.
OBSERVATIONS OF THE PANEL

94. The Panel concurs with the views of the Director that IFPRI should not be conceived as playing a primary service role for the CGIAR or for TAG in helping to establish research priorities among or within the various centres. If IFPRI gains full membership to the CGIAR system, it may want to consider limiting its activities within this area to specific functions undertaken at the request of the individual centres.

95. It may be desirable to assess in a more formal way the particular interests of the centres in collaborative relationships with IFPRI. A major constraint in developing potential complementarities is in the wide geographic dispersion of the centres. This raises a fundamental question as to the appropriate location of IFPRI staff engaged in collaborative projects. Considerable time and effort may need to be devoted to establishing and strengthening linkages with centres and national programmes, and to developing an understanding of the process of technology development itself. The final decision in this matter, of course depends upon the nature of the project and the personnel involved.

B. IFPRI and International Institutions in Agriculture

96. The Institute was founded in order to fill a perceived gap in the international organization structure, in respect to research on policy issues regarding food, as well as to perform an independent, continuing review and analysis of the world food situation. Thus, in some respects the Institute would be complementary to intergovernmental institutions, while in others it could compete with some functions of existing agencies, particularly FAO.

97. Actual activities of IFPRI, as reviewed in a former section, show that the Institute's programme has evolved and concentrated on the complementary role to international agencies. This can be followed by looking at each of IFPRI's programmes.

98. The Trends and Statistics Programme utilizes basically FAO data (and USDA statistics), with the purpose of generating series arranged so as to be most useful to the Institute's overall research, but IFPRI does not produce independent, primary data on world food. Where needed or convenient, IFPRI complements its Trend Analysis programme with data from the IBRD and other international agencies.

99. In the Production Programme, there clearly occurs the greatest complementarity between IFPRI and agricultural agencies of the U.N. family, IFAD, World Food Programme, etc. given the specific focus on research on food policy issues. Overlap could exist with FAO and regional agricultural organizations, but communication and care in project selection has avoided this possibility, stressing on the contrary the additional contributions that the Institute can make. For instance, the project on Fiscal Policy toward Agriculture has been encouraged by FAO and IBRD, and would be useful as well to other regional development banks; and similarly, the studies on irrigation and fertilizers.
100. The focus of the Consumption Research Programme determines that its output should generally supplement the work of other intergovernmental agencies, or be done in collaboration with them. Thus, the study of the Food Policy Systems in Bangladesh was done jointly with the World Bank; the proposed study on food subsidies involves collaboration with the FAO.

101. Greater overlap could occur in the Trade Programme, with agencies such as UNCTAD, GATT, FAO, WFC, etc. However, there appears to have been a special effort of IFPRI to communicate with these agencies, so that IFPRI in fact is conducting some studies in response to needs of these agencies. This is the case of the trade liberalization research, in collaboration with FAO and the study on a compensatory financing food security scheme, for the WFC.

102. IFPRI's role vis-a-vis other non-governmental organizations that deal with international agriculture (exclusive of the CGIAR system) such as TANS poses no conflict, since there are few of these agencies and their scope and resources are limited.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE PANEL

103. The Panel considers that IFPRI's role in the context of international agricultural agencies is sufficiently distinct and important, that the Institute should continue to perform its activities, regardless of whether it meets all the specific criteria of the CGIAR so as to be eligible for the Group's support.

104. IFPRI should be careful, however, not to establish itself as a service agency for other international bodies, which is a danger given the limited research capacity in the food policy area. The Institute could easily become overburdened with demands for specific studies, yielding to such demands would endanger IFPRI's programme scope, focus and quality.

105. Although IFPRI should carefully preserve its nature as an independent research institute, it must keep in regular contact with the family of international organizations. It is suggested that Institute staff members should participate occasionally in activities of international organizations, as a means to be sensitive of current concerns and trends which include, for instance, attending some of the major meetings of international organizations, or participation in country review missions.

C. IFPRI and National Institutions: Governmental and Non-Governmental

106. IFPRI's collaboration and interactions with national institutions will expand as the Institute's research programme gains momentum. These institutions consist of University departments interested in the subject, research institutions and the ministries and other governmental organizations dealing with problems of food and nutrition. Collaboration with the governmental institutions would be useful mainly for collecting the necessary material available from them, and also for organizing the collection of
fresh primary data wherever necessary and possible. Collaboration with the University departments and research institutions, on the other hand, could be on a wider scale involving joint studies, conferences and seminars.

107. Such interaction with governmental and non-governmental institutions would be fruitful, both for IFPRI and the national institutions concerned. IFPRI would need data, studies, ideas and insights on specific country problems which can best be provided by these organizations. Leading economists in these research institutions as well as in the governments could be invited to work at IFPRI and some of them indeed form the core staff of the Institute who have brought their experience and knowledge to bear upon their research work at IFPRI. IFPRI could in turn be expected to provide these national institutions of research with ideas, perspectives and scholars, some of whom may go back after they put in work at IFPRI for specified periods. Conferences and seminars organized occasionally on problems of food policy could be an effective means of such interaction. Such a collaboration at a broader level would be far more useful in raising the productivity of IFPRI as well as national institutes than collaboration confined either to specific projects or a framework designed to provide direct leadership to the national institutions from IFPRI. In particular, it would be necessary to resist the temptation and demands for undertaking advisory roles for the national governments, as this would not only make it impossible for IFPRI to cater to such demands without seriously undermining its own research work but would also unnecessarily place the IFPRI in an embarrassing position vis-a-vis the governments and people concerned as the issues involve sensitive areas.

VII. RELEVANCE OF IFPRI'S MANDATE AND ACTIVITIES TO THE OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA OF THE CGIAR

A. CGIAR Objectives

108. Compared to the mandate of IFPRI as it is stated under Chapter III, the objectives of the CGIAR would seem to have a much more narrow character, insofar as the latter is concerned with the needs of developing countries for special effort in agricultural research at the international and regional levels in critical subject areas unlikely otherwise to be adequately covered by existing research facilities.

109. However, the interpretation of the mandate of IFPRI as it appears from the present programme of work and the plans for the future would seem, at least for certain parts thereof, to fall more in line with the CGIAR objectives.
B. TAC Criteria

110. It must be admitted that the criteria of TAC have been worded in a way which appears more suitable in relation to the existing IARCs than to IFPRI. Nevertheless, the Institute has endeavoured to make some comments about its mandate and activities seen against this framework. A selection of these comments is set out in the following.

111. - There has been a gradual evolution of the concerns of CGIAR from an initial emphasis on specific production technologies to a broader concern with farming systems and to the participation of substantial segments of agriculture and people in the production and consumption benefits. It would seem that some parts of the work of IFPRI represent a logical extension and integration of the wider interests of the system.

112. - The research of IFPRI recognizes that there is no standard recipe for the design of technology and attempts to provide understanding of the range of variables which condition the success of technology for the main food commodities across geoclimatic regions under different sets of conditions. If this work could be developed as a diagnostic and prescriptive tool, it would be of value to the TAC, the CGIAR and the international centres in the design of research policy.

113. - It is just as simplistic to believe that price and other policies affecting production and distribution of food can be blindly transferred from one environment to another as to believe that specific crop varieties and practices can be so transferred. Improved food policy does require an integrated long-term research effort if policy decisions are to effectively favour societal objectives.

114. - It seems that governments are showing a growing desire for careful, empirically based, policy-oriented research, and IFPRI is concerned with defining key relationships to enhance the ability of policy makers to achieve the results they desire. While IFPRI is doing policy research and not policy per se, it proposes to describe relationships and set forth alternatives in a context that is helpful over a wide range of socio-political contexts.

115. - The basic scheme of the research programme of the Institute is based on the view that production policy, consumption policy and trade policy interact and that its most valuable contribution will lie in providing knowledge helpful to achieving the optimal combination of priorities under varying circumstances. In the same way, development strategy research is concerned with the policies determining overall allocation of resources to agriculture; links between agricultural production and growth in income, employment and consumption; and the role of trade in establishing and developing these links. The work on linkages is, therefore, considered by IFPRI to be of great importance and the area of greatest comparative advantage for the Institute. The research programme attempts to work on the key aspects of these policy issues, and the specific priorities are arrived at in consultation with production science research centres, government policy and international policy makers and from the insights of Institute staff.
116. - With regard to the international character of the work, it is stated that all of the Institute's research work is intended to have broad validity, at least in illustrating appropriate approaches. Also, it is claimed that there is a paucity of research in key areas which makes it essential to increase efficiency through an effective international institution that can provide broad leadership.

117. - Finally, the research of the Institute proposes to examine various means of assisting growth in effective demand. This effort could be of particular value to the production science centres in providing a wider range of options to deal with the equity objectives.

118. - It would appear from the above that IFPRI has made an effort to emphasize those aspects of the objectives and activities of the Institute which seem to meet the criteria established by TAC.
VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

119. In connection with the presentation of its conclusions and recommendations, the Panel would like as a preamble to draw the attention of TAC to the following points.

(i) The Panel was only allowed a period of 4 days for its studies and the preparation of the report, which made it impossible to scrutinize in detail all the activities and publications of the Institute.

(ii) IFPRI was set up in 1975 and the first staff joined in the autumn of that year, so that the Institute has had a relatively short period to implement its programme and prove its potential value.

(iii) The mandate of IFPRI as approved by the Board of Trustees is somewhat at variance with the objectives originally proposed by the TAC, although the significance of the differences depends on the interpretation of the mandate in the programmes of the Institute.

(iv) The programme of work of IFPRI has undergone certain changes during its period of existence, and there has been a change of management, which has not yet been able to fully reflect itself in the programme of the Institute.

120. In the light of these considerations, the Panel holds the opinion that the present juncture is not very suitable for an evaluation of the Institute and that these circumstances have influenced the conciseness of the findings of the Panel.

120. The Panel recognizes that, while there is a growing concern for the world food problem at national and international level, and collective will to take action for its solution, there is need of a better understanding of the multiple interactions of food production, distribution, consumption and trade in the context of economic growth in developing countries. While the analysis of the patterns of production, consumption and distribution within a country are clearly a national responsibility, the formulation of sound national food policies cannot be carried out without considering the possible influences of external factors such as international trade and food aid on the national food situation. Similarly, collective decisions among countries regarding the food problems cannot be made without having a full understanding of their possible effects on the food situation in individual countries and group of countries.

121. The knowledge and understanding of the mechanisms whereby these multiple influences and interactions develop at national level and at international level are still insufficient and this lack of knowledge can greatly reduce or jeopardize the impact of national and international efforts to increase the production of food through the development and use of improved production technologies.
122. Because a large part of the interactions between the different factors influencing the food situation are international in character and because of their complexity, the Panel confirms the need for a special international effort in research on the world food problems which could provide a better basis on which food policies can be formulated by governments at national and international levels.

123. The Panel recognizes that there is already a number of ongoing research programmes in this field. The Panel sees the uniqueness of IFPRI not in the individual research areas being addressed by the Institute but in the fact that this research is carried out by a staff which has a wide diversity of experience in both research and policy making in an equally wide number of developing countries and focused on linkages and interactions between food production, consumption, distribution and trade in a holistic approach. The Panel believes that, should IFPRI become a part of the CGIAR system, this would further enhance its uniqueness by enabling the Institute to provide a global perspective to the multiple interactions and effects of international research and technological advances generated by the IARCs. This would provide these centres with some important additional information for their consideration of priorities, their research approaches and their policies in their cooperation with national programmes in developing countries.

124. The Panel considers, however, that regardless of the CGIAR and the IARCs existence, there are strong arguments in favour of establishing such an Institute for meeting the demands for better information and independent analyses by individual countries and international organizations. Nevertheless when considering the relative weight of the different elements of the rationale for the inclusion of IFPRI in the CGIAR system, the Panel would call attention to the potential which IFPRI has in contributing to the overall impact of the ongoing national and international efforts in agricultural research. It stresses however that, while recognizing this potential asset to the CGIAR system, IFPRI should retain a capability to carry out food policy research activities, some of which may not necessarily be essential complements to other aspects of agricultural research but could be of particular value to national policy makers and international organizations in the field of food and agriculture. The Panel would however recommend that IFPRI continue to be selective in responding to the multiple potential demands of national and international organisations and not establish itself as an institution servicing the CGIAR system and/or other institutions. It would rather see it as an international research institution in its own right responding to the actual needs to fill certain gaps in food policy research.

125. The Panel therefore generally supports the broad mandate given to IFPRI by its founders and the innovative and realistic manner in which its Director tries to interpret and translate it into a well focused programme.

126. The Panel recommends that the Director continue his consultations with the multiple potential users of IFPRI's output (international and national institutions, including the IARCs) and further develop the rationale for the priorities and an adequate programme structure which reflect both the problem
areas addressed and their priorities on a longer term basis. This would also contribute to a fuller assessment of the likely requirements for additional personnel.

127. The Panel has also examined the research output of IFPRI during its first years of operations. It has been favourably impressed by the volume of this output, its relevance to the objectives of the Institute and to the problems addressed, and by the overall quality of IFPRI's publications. The Panel also recommends that, as a means of further enhancing the impact and the image of the Institute, its Board gives serious consideration to a location of the Institute in a developing country. It feels that such a location would place its research staff in an environment which would be more relevant to the objectives of the Institute. It would also avoid the perception of IFPRI by other national and international institutions, and the IARCs in particular, as having a somewhat privileged status in the CGIAR system. It could also protect IFPRI from undue donor influences and demands in its analysis of the world food problems. The Panel would in particular recommend that when becoming a member of the CGIAR system, IFPRI should not be used by the CGIAR as a kind of policy advisory body regarding priorities for resource allocations among and within other centres of the system and for ISNAR. A location in a developing country rather than in Washington could also be preferable in this respect.

128. The Panel recognizes that it is probably too early for the Institute to establish firm guidelines for its modus operandi as regards its cooperation with the IARCs and with individual countries as long as its capacity to be of assistance through its own research output remains limited. The Panel has noted with interest the cooperative programme being established with IRRI, IFDC and several countries of Asia as one of the possible approaches to its cooperation with developing countries. The Panel also supports the present trend whereby IFPRI is trying to establish closer links with national research institutions working in the same fields in developing countries and feels confident that this cooperation will enable IFPRI to assess further the ways and means whereby it might best discharge its limited mandate in contributing to the training of national personnel involved in food policy research and decision making.

129. Should TAC and the Board of IFPRI give favourable consideration to the observations and recommendations set out above, the Panel feels confident that the inclusion of IFPRI in the CGIAR system would make a significant contribution to the objectives which the CGIAR has set for itself in supporting international agricultural research aimed at alleviating the world food problem.
TAC MISSION TO IFPRI

List of Questions to be Addressed

1. What is the scope of food policy research as interpreted by IFPRI?

2. How IFPRI sees its role in collection, compilation and processing of agricultural statistics and other related data.

3. To which extent IFPRI's research covers nutrition aspects.

4. What role IFPRI sees for itself in the field of assistance to developing countries and training.

5. What are the main categories of research outputs which IFPRI provides or could provide?

6. What is the clientele for these different outputs: international development agencies (World Bank, UNDP, IFAD); intergovernmental institutions dealing with the food problems (FAO, WFC, WFP); the CGIAR and TAC; the IARCs; the governmental institutions of LDCs? How IFPRI's outputs complement the work of these institutions.

7. Which among these different outputs could meet a regular and continuing demand? Which are those dealing with ad hoc requests? What are the areas where gaps or duplication may occur?

8. What is the present mechanism of programme formulation at IFPRI? What is the involvement of other institutions concerned such as FAO and the IARCs in this process? How coordination of IFPRI programmes with those of other institutions is achieved.

9. What would be the priorities and forward plans of IFPRI in dealing with various requirements and demands, assuming that full membership is granted to it within the CG system?

10. What are the alternatives for granting CGIAR support to IFPRI? Should IFPRI be more closely associated with the CG and/or TAC Secretariats? What could be the possible links and respective roles of the newly proposed ISNAR and IFPRI in this field, if granted CGIAR support, as related to those of FAO?

11. Would it be possible for IFPRI to operate from a headquarters in a developing country? What proportion of IFPRI's staff might be expected to be operating in developing countries at any one time?
12. What would be the arrangements for the governance of IFPRI within the Consultative Group? What say would donors have in the appointment of the IFPRI Board?

13. What would be the arrangements for the financial and programme accountability of IFPRI? How would salary levels for IFPRI's staff be determined and on whose authority? What would be the total estimated cost to the Consultative Group and how would this be expected to develop over time?

Note: The Panel also took note of comments received from several members of the CGIAR on its terms of reference and the above list of questions.
APPENDIX III

TAC REVIEW MISSION TO IFPRI - TIMETABLE

Monday, 8th January: Mission members assembled in Washington.

Tuesday, 9th January:

0900 Briefing of Mission at IFPRI by the Director. All other staff members must be on call from 0845 onwards.

1015/1200 Trends and Statistics
1200/1300 Lunch. Buffet at which staff members met the Panel.
1300/1500 Production Programme
1500/1700 Distribution and Consumption Programme
1700/1800 Closed session of Panel

Wednesday, 10th January:

0900/1100 Trade Programme
1100/1200 Inter-Divisional Collaboration (IRRI/IFDC Programme-Food aid)
1200/1300 Buffet Lunch
1300/1430 Administration and Finance
1430/1600 Seminar: Bruce Stone. Agricultural Price Policies in the People's Republic of China
1600/1700 Communications Programme
1700/1800 Closed session of Panel

Thursday, 11th January:

0900/1100 Closed session of panel.
1100/1700 Closed session of panel.

Friday, 12th January:

0900/1700 Closed session of panel
1700/1800 Panel discusses conclusions with Director
1800 Panel departs.
Documents given to the members of the TAC Review Group

Publications


Research Report #2 - Recent and Prospective Developments in Food Consumption: Some Policy Issues.

Research Report #3 - Food Needs in Developing Countries: Projections of Production and Consumption to 1990.


Occasional Paper #1 - Commodity Trade Issues in International Negotiations, by Barbara Huddleston.

Occasional Paper #2 - Potential of Agricultural Exports to Finance Increased Food Imports in Selected Developing Countries, by Alberto Valdés, and Barbara Huddleston.

Research Highlights 1978

Manuscripts (forthcoming publications)

Impact of Subsidized Rice on Food Consumption and Nutrition in Kerala, S. Kumar.

Current and Projected Agricultural Research Expenditures in Developing Countries, by Peter Oram.

Criteria and approaches to the Analysis of Priorities for International Agricultural Research, by Peter Oram.


Assessing Food Insecurity in Developing Countries, by A. Valdés and P. Konandreas.

Food Insecurity in Colombia: A Food Supply or a Poverty Problem, by E. J. Garcia.
Grain Reserves, Food Aid and Food Insurance: How a Comprehensive Scheme Might Operate, by B. Rundleson.

Security of Rice Supplies: The ASEAN Region, by A. Siamwalla.

Reprints, Book Chapters, Addresses

Agriculture in the Semi-Arid Regions: Problems and Opportunities, P. Oram Reprinted from International Symposium on Rainfed Agriculture in Semi-Arid Regions, University of California, Riverside, California, April 1977.


Miscellaneous

Food and Agriculture: Objectives, Requirements, Strategy
(a report requested by the Bandt Commission)

Report 1976-1978 (the first Annual Report)

Administrative Briefing Materials

Research Program - 1979

Brief Curricula Vitae of Professional Staff Members

Seminars and Conferences

List of Replies to TAC Questions